

## TYPE IA SUPERNOVA EXPLOSIONS FROM HYBRID CARBON-OXYGEN-NEON WHITE DWARF PROGENITORS

DONALD E. WILLCOX<sup>1</sup>, DEAN M. TOWNSLEY<sup>2</sup>, ALAN C. CALDER<sup>3,4</sup>, PAVEL A. DENISSENKOV<sup>5,6</sup>, AND FALK HERWIG<sup>5,6</sup>*Draft version February 24, 2016*

## ABSTRACT

Motivated by recent results in stellar evolution that predict the existence of hybrid white dwarf (WD) stars with a C-O core inside an O-Ne shell, we simulate thermonuclear (Type Ia) supernovae from these hybrid progenitors. We use the FLASH code to perform multidimensional simulations in the deflagration to detonation transition (DDT) explosion paradigm. Our hybrid progenitor models were produced with the MESA stellar evolution code and include the effects of the Urca process, and we map the progenitor model to the FLASH grid. We performed a suite of DDT simulations over a range of ignition conditions consistent with the progenitor’s thermal and convective structure assuming multiple ignition points. To compare the results from these hybrid WD stars to previous results from C-O white dwarfs, we construct a set of C-O WD models with similar properties and similarly simulate a suite of explosions. We find that despite significant variability within each suite, trends distinguishing the explosions are apparent in their <sup>56</sup>Ni yields and the kinetic properties of the ejecta. We comment on the feasibility of these explosions as the source of some classes of observed subluminal events.

*Keywords:* hydrodynamics — nuclear reactions, nucleosynthesis, abundances — supernovae: general — white dwarfs

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) are bright stellar explosions that produce  $\sim 0.6 M_{\odot}$  of radioactive <sup>56</sup>Ni, the decay of which powers the light curve and leads to a relation between the peak brightness of an event and the rate of its decline from maximum (Phillips 1993). This relation enables SNe Ia to be used as “standard candles” for cosmological studies, and this use led to the discovery that the expansion of the Universe is accelerating due to dark energy (Riess et al. 1998; Perlmutter et al. 1999; Leibundgut 2001).

Despite intense study (driven in part by their application as distance indicators for cosmology), we still have only an incomplete understanding of the explosion mechanism and fundamental questions, such as the likely progenitor system(s), persist. It is widely accepted that SNe Ia result from the thermonuclear explosion of a white dwarf (WD) composed largely of C and O, with this understanding going back many decades (Hoyle & Fowler 1960; Arnett et al. 1971). The rapid thermonuclear fusion of C and O in a WD releases enough energy to unbind it, produces the <sup>56</sup>Ni necessary to power the light curve, and explains the lack of H observed in the spectra.

There are, however, several possible progenitor systems for such a configuration. All models involve a binary

system and at least one C-O WD, which follows from the original association of SNe Ia with C-O burning under degenerate conditions (Hoyle & Fowler 1960). Some proposed systems posit a single white dwarf, the single degenerate (SD) paradigm, and some posit the merger or collision of two white dwarfs, the double degenerate (DD) paradigm, and within these are variations.

The “classic” model is the Chandrasekhar-mass model in which a white dwarf gains mass from a companion, a main sequence or red giant star, or perhaps a He WD, and a thermonuclear runaway occurs just as it approaches the Chandrasekhar limiting mass (Hoyle & Fowler 1960; Truran & Cameron 1971; Whelan & Iben 1973; Nomoto et al. 1984). Alternately, in the sub-Chandrasekhar-mass scenario, explosive burning in the accreted layer triggers a detonation at the surface or in the core of a lower-mass WD (Nomoto 1980; Woosley et al. 1980; Sim et al. 2010).

The other main class of models is the DD progenitor, (Webbink 1984; Iben & Tutukov 1984), in which two WDs inspiral and merge. This scenario includes inspiraling pairs, collisions, violent mergers, and also the “core-degenerate” model where the merger takes place in a common envelope (Raskin et al. 2009; Pakmor et al. 2011; Kashi & Soker 2011; Pakmor et al. 2012; Shen et al. 2012). Also see Hillebrandt & Niemeyer (2000); Howell (2011); Hillebrandt et al. (2013); Calder et al. (2013) for additional discussion.

The observational evidence of one progenitor vs. another is conflicting. SNe Ia show a wide range of luminosities and also the possibility that there are two classes of progenitor (Mannucci et al. 2006; Howell et al. 2009; Howell 2011). Observational and population synthesis (Belczynski et al. 2005; Ruiter et al. 2011) arguments suggest that there simply may not be enough Chandrasekhar-mass progenitors to explain the observed SN Ia rate. There is, however, disagreement over the sig-

<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, 11794-3800, USA; donald.willcox@stonybrook.edu

<sup>2</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, 35487-0324, USA

<sup>3</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, 11794-3800, USA

<sup>4</sup> Institute for Advanced Computational Sciences, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, 11794-5250, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Victoria, PO Box 1700, STN CSC, Victoria, BC V8W 2Y2, Canada

<sup>6</sup> Joint Institute for Nuclear Astrophysics, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA

nificance of these observations (Hachisu et al. 2008) and the suggestion has been made that instead we do not fully understand the pre-supernova evolution of the different progenitor systems (Di Stefano 2010). Certainly there is disagreement in the interpretation of observations that stems from uncertainty in the accretion phase of SD evolution (Hachisu et al. 2010). Additionally, the oft-cited claim that the WD in the SD channel would lose mass via nova explosions, thereby preventing it from reaching the Chandrasekhar mass, is questioned (Zorotovic et al. 2011). Prior work on novae and rapidly accreting WDs strongly suggests that novae will not be able to grow (Denissenkov et al. 2013a, 2014), especially not from WD masses of  $0.83 M_{\odot}$ , suggested to be the mean mass of WDs in cataclysmic variables in Zorotovic et al. (2011). However, if it is possible to get a SNe Ia out of the SD scenario, then “hybrid” C-O-Ne WDs (WDs with a C-O core in an O-Ne shell) (Denissenkov et al. 2015) may play a key role (cf. Section 2). These hybrid WDs would provide ignitable Ia progenitors that are already very close to the Chandrasekhar limiting mass, and are therefore perhaps the most likely to produce a SNe Ia.

While there is uncertainty, some contemporary observations do strongly support the SD progenitor. Events like PTF11kx and others show distinct circumstellar shells of material that can be best explained in the SD context (Dilday et al. 2012; Silverman et al. 2013). The SNR 3C 397 is heralded as a case where only an explosion from a Chandrasekhar-mass progenitor can produce the nuclei seen in the remnant, due to the need for electron captures at high density (Yamaguchi et al. 2015). The recent observation of a UV pulse (Cao et al. 2015) in the early evolution of an SN Ia also supports the SD model. Observations of remnants also offer support for Chandrasekhar-mass explosions, including wind blown shells in RCW86 (Williams et al. 2011) and shocked circumstellar material/bubble in the Kepler remnant (Chiotellis et al. 2012; Burkey et al. 2013). Altogether, there is substantial evidence that suggests that the SD channel plays a role in at least some of the observed SNe Ia (Baron 2014).

The sub-Chandrasekhar-mass model does not have the population synthesis arguments working against it and we know low-mass WDs in binary systems exist. Systems that are believed will evolve to an explosion have been observed (Kilic et al. 2014), potential events have been identified (Geier et al. 2013; Inserra et al. 2015), and the Type Iax sub-class of SN Ia (Foley et al. 2013; Wang et al. 2013) have been suggested as being sub-Chandrasekhar-mass events themselves.

Observational evidence also supports the DD progenitor system, and the scenario is increasingly seen as the likely progenitor of some events. SN 2011fe has been intensely observed and does not show features in its spectra that would be expected if there were a normal stellar companion (Graham et al. 2015), suggesting a DD system. Super-Chandrasekhar mass explosions like SN 2007if (Scalzo et al. 2010; Yuan et al. 2010) and SNLS 03D3bb (Howell et al. 2006) also suggest mergers. There are also many population synthesis arguments in favor of mergers as well (see Maoz et al. 2014, for a review).

### 1.1. The Chandrasekhar-mass Single Degenerate Scenario

In the Chandrasekhar-mass scenario, the central temperature and density of the WD increase as it accretes mass from a binary companion and approaches the limiting Chandrasekhar mass. As the mass approaches the limit, central conditions become hot enough for carbon fusion to begin (via the  $^{12}\text{C}-^{12}\text{C}$  reaction), driving the development of convection throughout the interior of the WD (Baraffe et al. 2004; Woosley et al. 2004; Wunsch & Woosley 2004; Kuhlen et al. 2006; Nonaka et al. 2012). As the central temperature reaches  $\sim 7 \times 10^8$  K, the fuel in a convective plume burns to completion before it can cool via expansion (Nomoto et al. 1984; Woosley et al. 2004), and a flame is born.

The nature of this burning, be it a supersonic detonation or subsonic deflagration, largely determines the outcome of the explosion. It has been known for some time that a purely supersonic burning front cannot explain observations because the supersonic front very rapidly incinerates the star without it having time to react and expand (Arnett et al. 1971). The lack of expansion allows most of the star to burn at high densities, which produces an excessive  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield and does not match the stratified composition of observed remnants (Mazzali et al. 2008). Instead, a subsonic deflagration must ignite, which allows the outer layers of the star to expand ahead of the burning front. In this case, the density of the expanding material decreases, which leads to incomplete burning of more mass and thus increased production of intermediate mass elements. This deflagration must accelerate via instabilities and turbulent interaction, a topic that has been explored extensively in the past (Khokhlov 1993; Bychkov & Liberman 1995; Bell et al. 2004; Khokhlov 1995; Niemeyer & Hillebrandt 1995; Khokhlov et al. 1997; Zingale & Dursi 2007; Cho et al. 2003; Röpke et al. 2003, 2004; Zingale et al. 2005; Schmidt et al. 2006a,b; Aspden et al. 2008; Woosley et al. 2009; Ciaraldi-Schoolmann et al. 2009; Hicks & Rosner 2013; Ciaraldi-Schoolmann et al. 2013; Jackson et al. 2014; Poludnenko 2015; Hicks 2015).

A deflagration alone will not produce a event of normal brightness and expansion velocity (Röpke et al. 2007). Instead, the initial deflagration must transition to a detonation after the star has expanded some in order to produce abundances and a stratified ejecta in keeping with observations (Khokhlov 1991; Höflich et al. 1995). The physics of this “deflagration-to-detonation transition” (DDT) are not completely understood, but there has been considerable study based on mechanisms involving flame fronts in highly turbulent conditions (Blinnikov & Khokhlov 1986; Woosley 1990; Khokhlov 1991; Höflich et al. 1995; Höflich & Khokhlov 1996; Khokhlov et al. 1997; Niemeyer & Woosley 1997; Höflich et al. 1998; Niemeyer 1999; Gamezo et al. 2005; Röpke 2007; Poludnenko et al. 2011; Ciaraldi-Schoolmann et al. 2013; Poludnenko 2015). These models generally reproduce the observations under certain assumptions about the ignition (Townsend et al. 2009), but research has shown that the results are very sensitive to the details of the ignition (Plewa et al. 2004; Gamezo et al. 2005; García-Senz & Bravo 2005; Röpke et al. 2007; Jordan et al. 2008). In our simulations, we initialize a detonation once the defla-

gration front reaches a characteristic DDT fuel density, which controls the degree of expansion the star undergoes during the deflagration stage. The implementation details are described further in Section 3.4.

### 1.2. Systematic Effects

Contemporary observational campaigns typically investigate how the brightness and rates of supernovae correlate to properties of the host galaxy such as mass and star formation rate (c.f. Graur & Maoz 2013; Graur et al. 2015). Of particular interest is the delay time distribution (DTD), the supernovae rate as a function of time elapsed from early, rapid star formation in the host galaxy, and how it may be used to constrain progenitor models (Hachisu et al. 2008; Conley et al. 2011; Howell 2011; Graur et al. 2011; Bianco et al. 2011; Maoz et al. 2012). See also the review by Maoz & Mannucci (2012). Very recent results indicate evolution of the UV spectrum with redshift, providing evidence for systematic effects with cosmological time (Milne et al. 2015).

Motivated by this interest in correlations between properties of the host galaxy and the brightness and rate of events, earlier incarnations of our group performed suites of simulations in the DDT scenario with a modified version of the FLASH code (described below) to explore systematic effects on the brightness of an event measured by the yield of  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  (Krueger et al. 2010; Jackson et al. 2010; Krueger et al. 2012). The study we present here explores how explosions following from a new class of “hybrid” progenitors (Denissenkov et al. 2013b; Chen et al. 2014; Denissenkov et al. 2015) compares to these previous results.

## 2. HYBRID PROGENITOR MODELS

Rumors that the structure and evolution of stars is a solved problem (Hansen et al. 2004) are greatly exaggerated. Recent developments obtained with the modern software instrument MESA (Paxton et al. 2011, 2013, 2015) indicate that convective boundary mixing (CBM) in the cores of super asymptotic giant branch stars (super-AGB) plays a more critical role than previously thought. There are several examples in which the use of CBM improves agreement between models and observations, including that of Denissenkov et al. (2013b), which studied WD interior shell convection, and Herwig (2005); Werner & Herwig (2006), which treated He-shell burning in AGB stars. Denissenkov et al. (2013b); Chen et al. (2014) found that in some super-AGB stars, CBM halts the progression of carbon burning into the stellar core, leaving an unburnt C-rich core as large as  $0.2 M_{\odot}$  surrounded by an O-Ne-rich intershell region extending out to the accretion layer at the end of hydrostatic carbon burning. This effect of C-flame quenching via CBM is also confirmed by the extensive parameter study on C-burning in super-AGB stars in Farmer et al. (2015).

This is the situation in Denissenkov et al. (2015), which explored the stellar evolution of a super-AGB star with initial mass of  $6.9 M_{\odot}$  and obtained the hybrid white dwarf that is the focus of the present work. After hydrostatic carbon burning has ceased, the white dwarf accretes carbon-rich material at its surface, leading to the rise of temperature near its center. This results in carbon burning in the upper layer of the small carbon-rich core,

which, together with the thermal effects of the  $^{23}\text{Ne}/^{23}\text{Na}$  Urca process, provides off-center heating (Denissenkov et al. 2015) that drives convection throughout the entire white dwarf except the carbon-rich core.

Convection subsequently mixes the carbon-poor material in the O-Ne intershell region with carbon-rich material on the accreted layer and also partially mixes carbon-rich material from the core with the carbon-poor material in the O-Ne intershell. This proceeds along with accretion and carbon burning, until the latter yields peak temperatures near  $10^9$  K, around which the local heating time is shorter than the eddy turnover time so as to ignite thermonuclear runaway (Wunsch & Woosley 2004). At this point, the carbon-rich core has been significantly depleted of carbon and consists mostly of  $^{16}\text{O}$  and  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ , while the O-Ne intershell region has been enriched to a  $^{12}\text{C}$  abundance of  $\approx 0.14$  due to convective mixing. This scenario, immediately preceding the SN Ia-like explosion, is shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2. The process of mapping this MESA progenitor into hydrostatic equilibrium in FLASH is described in Section 3.2.

This hybrid WD has the interesting property that its mass before the onset of accretion is  $1.06 M_{\odot}$ , naturally closer to the Chandrasekhar limit than a traditional C-O WD. This means that such hybrid WD progenitors would require less mass accretion to approach the Chandrasekhar limit, which helps to resolve one of the difficulties with the SD progenitor system (Denissenkov et al. 2015; Chen et al. 2014; Kromer et al. 2015). The mass of this hybrid WD following accretion is  $1.36 M_{\odot}$ .

We note that these models include the influence of the URCA process on the convective phase of the pre-explosion progenitor. Our progenitor profiles are taken directly from MESA models presented in Denissenkov et al. (2015). These include contributions to the energy from thermal energy produced by the URCA process, but the underlying mixing length theory was not modified correspondingly. Thus the effect on the convection is only due to the energy loss/generation rate. Our progenitor profiles are shown in Figures 1 and 2 and correspond to the models in Figure 9a of Denissenkov et al. (2015). In this regard, this progenitor differs from the carbon-core models of Kromer et al. (2015) in that it includes the pre-explosion convective burning phase that spreads the carbon enrichment throughout the star before ignition of the flame front. While the progenitor we study consists mostly of  $^{16}\text{O}$  and  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ , having the average composition of ( $^{12}\text{C} = 0.17$ ,  $^{16}\text{O} = 0.42$ ,  $^{20}\text{Ne} = 0.32$ ), it differs from the O-Ne white dwarf of Marquardt et al. (2015) by having a much higher abundance of  $^{12}\text{C}$  due to accumulation and mixing of  $^{12}\text{C}$  material during the accretion phase, as described above. As discussed in Section 3.1 and Section 4.2, given the temperature profile of Figure 2, this available  $^{12}\text{C}$  is sufficient to drive both a subsonic deflagration and subsequently a supersonic detonation front as in previous work that applied the same DDT approach to C-O white dwarf progenitors (Krueger et al. 2012).

## 3. METHODOLOGY

A few significant new developments in our computational methods were necessary to simulate the explosion of the hybrid C-O-Ne WD. In Section 3.1, we obtain




**Figure 1.** Abundance profile of MESA progenitor (MESA) and its reconstruction on a uniform grid at 4 km spatial resolution with the hydrostatic equilibrium condition of Equation (2) enforced (FLASH). The reduced set of nuclides are shown, where  $X_{16\text{O}} = 1 - X_{12\text{C}} - X_{20\text{Ne}} - X_{22\text{Ne}}$  for the abundances labeled FLASH. Solid lines and circles denote the abundances used in FLASH whereas plain solid lines denote the abundances used in MESA.




**Figure 2.** Temperature profile of MESA progenitor (MESA) shown with a solid red line and its reconstruction on a uniform grid at 4 km spatial resolution (FLASH) with grid zones shown in blue circles.

the steady-state detonation structure for the hybrid C-O-Ne fuel and compare its detonation characteristics with those of C-O fuel to analyze the suitability of our combustion model in FLASH. Then in Section 3.2 we map the hybrid C-O-Ne WD into a uniform spatial grid to initialize FLASH while taking care to preserve hydrostatic equilibrium. We comment in Section 3.3 on our FLASH combustion model and in Section 3.4 on the deflagration to detonation transition (DDT) scheme. Finally, we describe the simulation geometry and the adaptive mesh refinement used in Section 3.5.

### 3.1. Modifications for C-O-Ne Burning

The combustion model in FLASH that we use for Type Ia supernovae simulations (Calder et al. 2007; Townsley et al. 2007; Seitenzahl et al. 2009; Townsley et al. 2009; Jackson et al. 2014; Townsley et al. 2015) separates the burning into four states: unburned fuel, C-fusion ash, a silicon-group-dominated nuclear statistical quasi-equilibrium (NSQE) state, and a full nuclear sta-

tistical equilibrium (NSE) state dominated by iron-group elements (IGEs). The progress of combustion from one of these states to the next is tracked by three scalar progress variables whose dynamics is calibrated to reproduce the timescales of reactions that convert material among these states. Previous work has focused on fuel mixtures composed principally of  $^{12}\text{C}$ ,  $^{16}\text{O}$ , and  $^{22}\text{Ne}$ . Simulation of the hybrid models required extension of this burning model to account for the presence of  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  as a large abundance in the fuel. Here we describe both how  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  is processed during combustion, and the modifications made to the burning model that accommodate it.

The burning stages above are determined by the hierarchy of timescales for the consecutive consumption of C and O via fusion and Si via photo-disintegration and alpha capture. Investigation of the inclusion of  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  focused on whether an additional Ne-consumption stage would be required, and, if not, what stage should include Ne consumption. In order to characterize the physical burning sequence that we want to model, we performed a series of simulations of detonations propagating through WD material with the TORCH nuclear reaction network software (Timmes 1999, 2015).<sup>7</sup> TORCH is a general reaction network package capable of solving networks with up to thousands of nuclides. A mode is implemented that computes the one-dimensional spatial thermodynamic and composition structure of a steady-state planar detonation using the Zel'dovich, von Neumann, and Döring (ZND) model (Fickett & Davis 1979; Townsley et al. 2015). We use a reaction network composed of 225 nuclides consisting of the 200 nuclides in Woosley & Weaver (1995) in addition to the 25 neutron-rich nuclides added by Calder et al. (2007) to improve coverage of electron capture processes in the Fe group.

For the multi-species fuel and ash relevant to typical white dwarf material, the ZND detonation exhibits the stages that motivate the combustion model. Figure 3 shows these stages as they appear in a ZND detonation calculation in fuel with the fractional composition ( $^{12}\text{C} = 0.50$ ,  $^{16}\text{O} = 0.48$ ,  $^{22}\text{Ne} = 0.02$ ) corresponding to the composition found in the interior of a C-O WD, and a fuel density of  $10^7$  g cm $^{-3}$ . The evolution of the mass fractions in time following the passage of the shock through the zone of material is plotted below the density structure in Figure 3. The time range of the four states representing the burning stages are indicated by colors in the upper panel of Figure 3, with the consecutive states separated by the  $^{12}\text{C}$ - $^{28}\text{Si}$ ,  $^{16}\text{O}$ - $^{28}\text{Si}$ , and  $^{28}\text{Si}$ - $^{54}\text{Fe}$  crossing times. It can be seen that the times of the density plateaus are directly comparable to the times at which the primary energy release transitions from one fuel source to another, as, e.g., when the  $^{12}\text{C}$  fraction has fallen to  $\approx 1\%$  of its initial value just before  $10^{-8}$  s.

In our combustion models for C-O progenitors, consumption of the initial fuel is modeled as a two-step process. The two stages represent the consumption first of  $^{12}\text{C}$ , then of  $^{16}\text{O}$ , mimicking the sequence seen in the detonation structure shown in Figure 3 for “Fuel” and “Ash” stages. At the end of this second stage the ma-

<sup>7</sup> TORCH is available from <http://cococubed.asu.edu>, and the modified version used for this study is available from <http://astronomy.ua.edu/townsley/code>.




**Figure 3.** Density (upper) and abundance (lower) structure in the post-shock flow of a ZND detonation calculation of C-O WD material. The upper panel is shaded to show the fuel (red), ash (blue), NSQE (green), and NSE (gray) burning stages, demarcated by the  $^{12}\text{C}$ - $^{28}\text{Si}$ ,  $^{16}\text{O}$ - $^{28}\text{Si}$ , and  $^{28}\text{Si}$ - $^{54}\text{Fe}$  crossing times. The initial composition is  $X_{^{16}\text{O}} = 0.48$ ,  $X_{^{22}\text{Ne}} = 0.02$ ,  $X_{^{12}\text{C}} = 0.50$ , and  $X_{^{20}\text{Ne}} = 0.00$ , and the pre-shock density is  $10^7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ .

terial is in a  $^{28}\text{Si}$ -dominated NSQE state (Calder et al. 2007; Townsley et al. 2007). To determine how the burning stages change with the inclusion of  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ , as is the case in the hybrid C-O-Ne progenitor, we perform ZND calculations with an admixture of  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  ranging from 0.01 to 0.45, at the expense of  $^{12}\text{C}$  content. For each composition we find the minimally overdriven solution, as was done in the C-O case. Out to the minimum in density, this solution is the same as the eigenvalue ZND solution, which corresponds to a self-supported detonation (Fickett & Davis 1979; Townsley et al. 2015). This computation gives the resolved detonation structure in C-O-Ne Hybrid WD matter.

The eigenvalue detonation speeds from ZND calculations in material with  $^{12}\text{C}$  fraction varying from 0.05 to 0.5 are shown in Figure 4, demonstrating that self-supported detonations in this progenitor are feasible with only small variation in speed across this range of  $^{12}\text{C}$  fractions. Figure 5 shows the effect of simultaneously adding  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  and reducing  $^{12}\text{C}$  on the density profile. Lowering the  $^{12}\text{C}$  fraction weakens the shock and lengthens the timescales of the step features, corresponding to more slowly burning fuel and ash, as might be expected from the lower energy release afforded by the  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ . However, it is noteworthy that no qualitatively new features arise from the change in fuel source that would suggest that more than 4 representative burning stages are needed.

Qualitative similarity between C-O and C-O-Ne detonation structures are visible in the mass fractions as well. To demonstrate this, the abundance structures with ini-




**Figure 4.** Self-supported detonation speed plotted versus carbon fraction in fuel with initial (pre-shock) density of  $10^7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  and initial composition of  $X_{^{16}\text{O}} = 0.48$  and  $X_{^{22}\text{Ne}} = 0.02$ . The sum  $X_{^{12}\text{C}} + X_{^{20}\text{Ne}}$  is kept constant.




**Figure 5.**

Density structures shaded with varying  $^{12}\text{C}$  mass fraction, keeping constant the sum  $X_{^{12}\text{C}} + X_{^{20}\text{Ne}}$ . The rest of the composition is  $X_{^{16}\text{O}} = 0.48$  and  $X_{^{22}\text{Ne}} = 0.02$ .

tial  $^{12}\text{C}$  abundances of 0.5, 0.3, 0.15, and 0.05 are shown in Figure 6. We find that the  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  burns simultaneously with whatever  $^{12}\text{C}$  is present, producing primarily  $^{28}\text{Si}$ . The Ne-C burning stage is then followed by  $^{16}\text{O}$  burning to silicon-group NSQE elements and then on to NSE, just as in a model with no initial  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ , except for the progressively later  $^{16}\text{O}$  burning time.

A graphic representation of the most significant nuclides by mass fraction and the stage in which they are important is shown in Figure 7 for an initial  $^{12}\text{C}$  fraction of 0.15, representative of the majority of the hybrid stellar profile (cf. Figure 1). Nuclides are categorized based on the time at which they were maximally abundant in the network and shaded by their maximum abundance. Nuclides within the purple color palette were maximally abundant during the initial “fuel-burning” stage after the beginning of fusion and before the  $^{28}\text{Si}$  becomes equally abundant with  $^{12}\text{C}$ , the  $^{12}\text{C}$ - $^{28}\text{Si}$  crossing time  $t_{\text{fa}}$ . Blue




**Figure 6.** Mass Fraction Evolution for ZND Detonations with varying initial  $^{12}\text{C}$  and  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  mass fractions, calculated for an initial density of  $10^7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ .

nuclides were maximally abundant after  $t_{\text{fa}}$  but prior to the  $^{16}\text{O}$ - $^{28}\text{Si}$  crossing time  $t_{\text{aq}}$ , and nuclides maximally abundant after  $t_{\text{aq}}$  but before the  $^{28}\text{Si}$ - $^{54}\text{Fe}$  crossing time  $t_{\text{qn}}$  are plotted in green. Nuclides maximally abundant




**Figure 7.** Our reaction network of 225 nuclides is shown, with nuclides shaded by their maximum abundance and categorized based on whether they were maximally abundant before the earliest of the following crossing times:  $^{12}\text{C}$ - $^{28}\text{Si}$  (purple),  $^{16}\text{O}$ - $^{28}\text{Si}$  (blue),  $^{28}\text{Si}$ - $^{54}\text{Fe}$  (green). Nuclides maximally abundant after the  $^{28}\text{Si}$ - $^{54}\text{Fe}$  crossing time are shown in orange. The initial composition used is  $X_{^{16}\text{O}} = 0.48$ ,  $X_{^{22}\text{Ne}} = 0.02$ ,  $X_{^{12}\text{C}} = 0.15$ , and  $X_{^{20}\text{Ne}} = 0.35$ .

following  $t_{\text{qn}}$  are IGEs together with protons and alpha particles and are shaded in orange. Note that for the time scales we adopt the notation of (Townsend et al. 2015), which describes the burning stages in detail.

The burning model we are using computes the rates for progression through the burning stages from the local temperature and the energy release from a set of major fuel abundances, previously including  $^{12}\text{C}$ ,  $^{16}\text{O}$ , and  $^{22}\text{Ne}$ . We have found here that any  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  is consumed along with  $^{12}\text{C}$  and that otherwise the burning is quite similar to that with just  $^{12}\text{C}$  and  $^{16}\text{O}$  as principal constituents. In consequence, the only necessary modification to our burning model is to include  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  in the abundances of the initial state in the burning model. This accounts for the difference in binding energy of  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  compared to  $^{12}\text{C}$  and gives lower burning temperatures. Additionally, throughout the majority of the progenitor outside the core ignition region, due to prior convective mixing, the  $^{12}\text{C}$  content is high enough that we will extrapolate the laminar flame speeds of Timmes & Woosley (1992); Chamulak et al. (2008). We consider this a reasonable approximation since much of the flame propagation is dominated by Rayleigh-Taylor overturn and turbulence.

### 3.2. Mapping a MESA Profile to FLASH While Preserving Hydrostatic Equilibrium

The temperature and composition at the base of the convective zone in the hybrid C-O-Ne white dwarf provides a natural flame initialization region for simulation of thermonuclear runaway in the DDT scenario, so we map the MESA profile into the FLASH domain preserving its features at 4 km spatial resolution. We do this by first converting the MESA model to a uniform grid by mass-weighted averaging of quantities in MESA zones with spacing less than 4 km and using quadratic interpolation to estimate quantities where MESA zones have spacing greater than 4 km. Although our combustion model in FLASH does not evolve nuclide abundances, it uses the initial abundances of  $^{12}\text{C}$ ,  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  and  $^{22}\text{Ne}$  (as

suming the rest is  $^{16}\text{O}$ ) to compute the initial mean nuclear binding energy and electron fraction. Therefore, we also represent the full set of nuclides in the MESA profile by this reduced set of four nuclides in the uniformly gridded profile, requiring the carbon mass fractions to be identical because there is still sufficient  $^{12}\text{C}$  in the star to sustain a detonation front. In addition, we use  $^{22}\text{Ne}$  in the reduced set to account for the  $Y_e$  of the full set of nuclides, and we constrain  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  and  $^{16}\text{O}$  to be in the same ratio  $R$  in both sets of abundances. These constraints provide the following definitions for the reduced abundances used for FLASH:

$$X_{^{12}\text{C}}^{\text{FLASH}} = X_{^{12}\text{C}}^{\text{MESA}} \quad (1a)$$

$$X_{^{22}\text{Ne}}^{\text{FLASH}} = 22 \cdot \left( \frac{1}{2} - Y_e^{\text{MESA}} \right) \quad (1b)$$

$$R = X_{^{20}\text{Ne}}^{\text{MESA}} / X_{^{16}\text{O}}^{\text{MESA}} \quad (1c)$$

$$X_{^{16}\text{O}}^{\text{FLASH}} = \frac{1 - X_{^{12}\text{C}}^{\text{FLASH}} - X_{^{22}\text{Ne}}^{\text{FLASH}}}{R + 1} \quad (1d)$$

$$X_{^{20}\text{Ne}}^{\text{FLASH}} = R \cdot X_{^{16}\text{O}}^{\text{FLASH}}. \quad (1e)$$

Nothing constrains the resulting uniformly gridded profile to be in hydrostatic equilibrium (HSE), however, so we next construct an equilibrium profile by applying the HSE pressure constraint

$$P_{\text{EOS}}(\rho_i, T_i, X_i) = \frac{g\Delta r}{2}(\rho_i + \rho_{i-1}). \quad (2)$$

Starting at the uniformly gridded profile’s central density and using its temperature and composition in each zone together with the HELM equation of state (EOS) of Almgren et al. (2010), we solve Equation (2) for the density in each zone. In Equation (2),  $\Delta r$  indicates the zone width,  $T_i$  is the temperature in zone  $i$ ,  $X_i$  is the composition in zone  $i$ , and  $g$  is the gravitational acceleration at the boundary of zone  $i$  and  $i - 1$  due to the mass enclosed by zone  $i - 1$  and below. The resulting uniformly gridded, equilibrium profile (FLASH) and the original profile (MESA) are shown for comparison in Figures 1 and 2. The values of the total mass before and after this procedure differ by  $6 \times 10^{-3} M_\odot$ . This procedure produced a structure that was stable in FLASH, with fluctuations in central density less than 3%, for at least 5 seconds with no energy deposition. Finally, we replaced the EOS routine in the public FLASH distribution with that from Almgren et al. (2010) to obtain a more consistent tabulation.

### 3.3. Combustion and Explosion Mechanisms In The FLASH Code

To simulate the explosion from either hybrid or traditional progenitor models, we use a modified version of FLASH<sup>8</sup>, an Eulerian adaptive-mesh compressible hydrodynamics code developed by the ASC/Alliances Center for Astrophysical Thermonuclear Flashes at the University of Chicago (Fryxell et al. 2000; Calder et al. 2002). While FLASH is capable of evolving thermonuclear reaction networks coupled to the hydrodynamics, in order to

treat a  $\leq 1$  cm flame front in full-star simulations of Type Ia supernovae, we use a coarsened flame model that uses an advection-diffusion-reaction (ADR) scheme to evolve a scalar variable representing the progression of burning from fuel to ash compositions as detailed in Calder et al. (2007); Townsley et al. (2007, 2009). An additional scalar represents the burning progress from ash to intermediate-mass silicon-group elements in nuclear statistical quasi-equilibrium (NSQE). A final scalar represents the burning of silicon-group elements to IGEs in nuclear statistical equilibrium (NSE). The timescales for evolving these scalars are density and temperature-dependent and are determined from self-heating and steady-state detonation calculations with a 200+ species nuclear reaction network (Calder et al. 2007; Townsley et al. 2015). For our evaluation of the suitability of this burning scheme for fuel with an admixture of  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ , see Section 3.1.

### 3.4. Deflagration-to-Detonation Transition

This study presents simulations of the thermonuclear explosions of both a hybrid C-O-Ne white dwarf progenitor (Denissenkov et al. 2015) and a C-O white dwarf progenitor similar to that used in previously published suites of SN Ia simulations (Krueger et al. 2012). In both cases, we initialize the simulations with a “matchhead” consisting of a region near or at the white dwarf’s center that is fully burned to nuclear statistical equilibrium (NSE). The energy release from this initial burn ignites a subsonic thermonuclear flame front that buoyantly rises and partially consumes the star while the star expands in response. As detailed in Townsley et al. (2009); Jackson et al. (2010), in order to effect a deflagration-to-detonation transition, we suppose the DDT point to be parameterizable by a fuel density  $\rho_{\text{DDT}}$  at which the subsonic flame reaches the distributed burning regime where the flame region has become sufficiently turbulent that a supersonic detonation front may arise, self-supported by the energy release from the nuclear burning proceeding behind the detonation shock front.

We use a similar DDT parameterization for our C-O simulations as in the SN Ia simulations of Krueger et al. (2012). Thus, when the deflagration reaches a point where it is at  $\rho_{\text{DDT}} = 10^{7.2} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ , we place a region fully burned to NSE 32 km radially outwards from this point that is of size 12 km in radius. Multiple DDT points may arise, but they are constrained to be at least 200 km apart. Our DDT parameterization for the hybrid C-O-Ne simulations is identical, and we chose to use a DDT transition density of  $\rho_{\text{DDT}} = 10^{7.2} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  because it is the lowest density for which all the realizations in our hybrid suite reliably reached the end of the detonation phase of the explosion when nuclear burning progress freezes out.

### 3.5. Mesh Geometry And Refinement

We performed our calculations in two-dimensional  $z - r$  cylindrical coordinates, extending radially from 0 to 65,536 km and along the axis of symmetry from  $-65,536$  km to 65,536 km. We selected a maximum refinement level corresponding to 4 km resolution using the PARAMESH adaptive mesh refinement scheme described in Fryxell et al. (2000). This resolution permitted efficiency in performing many repeated simulations with

<sup>8</sup> FLASH is available from <http://flash.uchicago.edu>. Our modifications for C-O WDs are available from <http://astronomy.ua.edu/townsley/code>.

different initial conditions. The 4 km resolution was also informed by previous resolution studies in Townsley et al. (2007, 2009), that found that in 2-D DDT simulations of C-O white dwarf explosions, the trends with resolution of total mass above the DDT density threshold at the DDT time are fairly robust. The amount of high density mass at the DDT is important because it reflects the extent of neutronization during the deflagration and thus correlates with the IGE yield of the explosion. In addition, we wish to compare the hybrid IGE yields and other explosion characteristics with those of explosions from C-O white dwarf progenitors previously explored in Krueger et al. (2012), which used 4 km resolution in FLASH with the same  $z-r$  geometry we describe above. We can thus make our comparison robust by controlling for resolution and geometry factors.

#### 4. SIMULATIONS AND RESULTS

##### 4.1. Reference C-O WD Model

To compare the resulting features of Type Ia supernovae produced by the hybrid model to those of previous studies of centrally ignited C-O white dwarfs in the DDT paradigm (Krueger et al. 2010, 2012), we generate a reference C-O model. The reference model has the same central density as the hybrid model with a central temperature of  $7 \times 10^8$  K, a core composition of ( $^{12}\text{C} = 0.4$ ,  $^{20}\text{Ne} = 0.03$ ,  $^{16}\text{O} = 0.57$ ) and envelope composition of ( $^{12}\text{C} = 0.5$ ,  $^{20}\text{Ne} = 0.02$ ,  $^{16}\text{O} = 0.48$ ). For comparison, Figures 8 and 9 show the density and temperature profiles of the C-O and C-O-Ne hybrid WD. Because the peak temperature of the C-O WD is at the center, we initialize a suite of deflagrations in the C-O model by instantaneously burning a region centered on the center of the star with a nominal radius of 150 km and 35 sets of randomly seeded amplitude perturbations including those of Krueger et al. (2012), which followed the method of Townsley et al. (2009).

##### 4.2. Ignition Conditions for the C-O-Ne Hybrid WD

Given the temperature and composition profile of the hybrid model, if it is to undergo thermonuclear runaway,  $^{12}\text{C}$  ignition will begin at the base of the convective zone coinciding with the temperature peak and  $^{12}\text{C}$  abundance of  $\approx 0.14$ . We therefore initialize a deflagration by instantaneously burning a thin shell of material at the peak temperature corresponding to a stellar radius of 350 km. Due to lack of constraints on the exact geometry of the ignition region, we parameterize the thickness of the burned shell by an angular sinusoidal function with variable harmonic number and amplitude as shown in Figure 14 at 0.0 s. The harmonic number controls the number of initially burned regions and the amplitude controls their size. With this form of initialization, we generate a suite of 35 hybrid realizations corresponding to a range of initially burned masses from  $3.0 \times 10^{-3} M_\odot$  to  $1.3 \times 10^{-2} M_\odot$  and a number of initial burned regions from 1 to 10.

We demonstrate the influence of the number-and-amplitude parameters using the final  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield as a proxy for the explosion results in Figure 10 and Figure 11. Because we use the same ignition geometry and conditions for the C-O realizations as were used in Krueger et al. (2012), the general size of the initially




**Figure 8.** Density profiles of the hybrid C-O-Ne white dwarf (red) and the reference C-O white dwarf (blue), prepared at the same central density.




**Figure 9.** Temperature profiles of the hybrid C-O-Ne white dwarf (red) and the reference C-O white dwarf (blue).

burned region for the C-O realizations remains very near  $0.0084 M_\odot$ . However, because the nature of the ignition in the C-O-Ne hybrid progenitor is unknown, we chose to sample the number-and-amplitude parameter space to provide a range of initially burned masses for comparison. In spite of the scatter in Figure 10, we performed a linear fit between the  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield and initially burned mass for the C-O-Ne realizations, obtaining a slope indistinguishable from zero within uncertainties and an intercept that matches the average  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield for the C-O-Ne realizations (Table 1). We also show in Figure 11 that most of the variation in  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield from the C-O-Ne realizations originates from the interplay between the number of ignition regions and their size. The more ignition regions that are used, the greater effect the variation on their size has on the spread in  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yields.

Using these parameters to vary the initial burned mass and its distribution within the progenitor, we evaluate the effect of this parameterization on the estimated  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield, IGE yield, binding energy, and other explosion properties in the following section.




**Figure 10.** Dependence of the final  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield on the initially burned mass at ignition for the 35 C-O (red) and 35 C-O-Ne realizations (green).




**Figure 11.** Dependence of the final  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield on the distribution of the initially burned mass at ignition for the 35 C-O-Ne realizations.

#### 4.3. Characteristics of Explosions from C-O and C-O-Ne WD Models

We simulate the explosions of the hybrid and C-O realizations through the end of the detonation phase and compare their features in Figures 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19 below. We compare the  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yields in the C-O and hybrid models, estimated from  $Y_e$  and the NSE progress variable, by assuming the composition in NSE is  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  plus equal parts  $^{54}\text{Fe}$  and  $^{58}\text{Ni}$ , as described in Townsley et al. (2009); Meakin et al. (2009).

Production of  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  is comparable between the C-O and hybrid cases (Figure 12), with the full range of values from each suite of simulations shown in the shaded regions and the mean values shown by solid curves. The DDT event can be distinguished in the  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  evolution by the sharp increase in the rate of  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  production around 1.5 s that rapidly yields over  $0.5 M_\odot$  of  $^{56}\text{Ni}$ . While the C-O cases show a wider variation in the time at which the DDT occurs, these also have a narrower spread in final  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  mass relative to the hybrid models. The hybrid




**Figure 12.** Evolution of the estimated  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yields for C-O and Hybrid C-O-Ne WD Realizations. The time-averaged value among C-O realizations is shown in yellow, with the full range of values at any point in time for the C-O realizations shown in red. Likewise, the time-averaged value among C-O-Ne realizations is shown in blue and their range of values shown in green.




**Figure 13.** Evolution of the binding energy for C-O and Hybrid C-O-Ne WD Realizations. The time-averaged value among C-O realizations is shown in yellow, with the full range of values at any point in time for the C-O realizations shown in red. Likewise, the time-averaged value among C-O-Ne realizations is shown in blue and their range of values shown in green.

models also tend to produce more  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  in the deflagration phase and some of them show a temporary plateau in  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  production between 1.5 s and 2 s. The same feature is also evident in the binding energy curves of Figure 13, computed by summing the realization's gravitational potential, internal, and kinetic energies.

This feature is a peculiarity of the off-center ignition in the hybrid models that is absent in the C-O cases and results from the relatively  $^{12}\text{C}$ -poor, cooler core region burning about 0.25 s after the detonation front has swept through the rest of the star. This delayed burning is shown in Figure 14, which demonstrates the progression of the detonation front into the core. Although a feature evolving over so short a time this early in the explosion will likely not be visible in the supernova light curves, the delayed contribution of the core to  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  production




**Figure 14.** Progress of the burning front into the stellar core for one hybrid C-O-Ne realization, delayed relative to complete burning throughout the rest of the star. For reference, the initially burned geometry is shown at left. Material is shaded based on the reaction progress variables so that **White** denotes unburned fuel ( $^{12}\text{C}$ ,  $^{16}\text{O}$  &  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ ) and **Red** denotes ash from  $^{12}\text{C}$  and  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ -burning. **Green** then denotes material in quasi-nuclear statistical equilibrium (primarily intermediate-mass silicon-group elements), and **Black** denotes material in nuclear statistical equilibrium (IGEs and  $\alpha$ -particles). From left to right, the burning is shown at 0.0 s, 1.9 s, 2.0 s, and 2.1 s. The DDT time for this realization is  $\approx 1.4$  s.




**Figure 15.** Evolution of the total mass having density greater than  $2 \times 10^7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  for C-O and Hybrid C-O-Ne WD Realizations. The time-averaged value among C-O realizations is shown in yellow, with the full range of values at any point in time for the C-O realizations shown in red. Likewise, the time-averaged value among C-O-Ne realizations is shown in blue and their range of values shown in green.

may modify the  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  distribution in space and velocity, potentially yielding spectral differences compared to non-delayed hybrid as well as C-O white dwarf explosions.

The dynamical qualities of the explosion shown in the binding energy curves of Figure 13 indicate that the time distribution of unbinding is more narrow for the hybrid models than for the C-O models, though the hybrid models have a wider distribution of final binding energies in all cases lower than the binding energies of the C-O models within 1 s of becoming unbound. This should correlate to a lower expansion velocity of the ejecta, thus slower cooling and delayed transparency relative to ejecta from C-O models. The binding energy curves also ex-




**Figure 16.** Final IGE yields for a range of deflagration expansion, where the degree of expansion is characterized by the mass denser than  $2 \times 10^7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  at the DDT time. Individual C-O (red) and C-O-Ne (green) realizations are shown, together with a rectangular area centered at their average values with size extending  $\pm 1\sigma$  along each axis for C-O (yellow) and C-O-Ne (blue) groups.

plain the differences in expansion the models undergo during deflagration and detonation, shown by the mass above the density threshold  $2 \times 10^7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  in Figure 15. For times prior to  $\approx 1.2$  s, the C-O mass curves lie on average slightly lower than the hybrid mass curves, indicative of a greater degree of expansion on average for the C-O models. However, the hybrid mass curve range encompasses that of the C-O mass curves until  $\approx 1.4$  s, reflective of the fact that until then, some hybrid realizations are more tightly bound than all the C-O realizations due to burning less mass and thus expanding less. During the detonation phase, however, the C-O models show a much wider variation in expansion than do the hybrid models in spite of having a smaller range of ki-




**Figure 17.** Production of  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  and Mass Burned to IGE for C-O (red) and Hybrid C-O-Ne (green) WD Realizations. To estimate the overall fraction for each case, a linear fit is shown for C-O (yellow) and C-O-Ne (blue) realizations.




**Figure 18.** Estimated fraction by mass of IGE material producing  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  evolving in time for C-O and Hybrid C-O-Ne WD Realizations. The time-averaged value among C-O realizations is shown in yellow, with the full range of values at any point in time for the C-O realizations shown in red. Likewise, the time-averaged value among C-O-Ne realizations is shown in blue and their range of values shown in green.

netic energies and mass burned to IGE (Figures 13 and 19 below) once unbound. This is due to the C-O models demonstrating a much wider range of DDT times than the hybrid models.

Figure 16 compares the final IGE yield of the C-O and C-O-Ne models with the degree by which the models expand during the deflagration phase. The latter is characterized by the mass above  $2 \times 10^7 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$  at the DDT time, with more high-density mass indicating less expansion during deflagration. The averages of both the C-O and C-O-Ne suites along both axes are indicated by the shaded regions with  $\pm 1\sigma$  widths. The trend for both C-O and C-O-Ne models is that less expansion during the deflagration phase results in greater IGE yields, expected because low expansion results in there being more high density fuel for the detonation to consume. In addition,




**Figure 19.** Mass burned to IGE For C-O and Hybrid C-O-Ne WD Realizations evolving in time. The time-averaged value among C-O realizations is shown in yellow, with the full range of values at any point in time for the C-O realizations shown in red. Likewise, the time-averaged value among C-O-Ne realizations is shown in blue and their range of values shown in green.

both the C-O and C-O-Ne models expand over similar ranges during deflagration on average, showing they are dynamically comparable in spite of having qualitatively different deflagration ignition geometries. Furthermore, for similar deflagration expansion, the C-O models tend to yield consistently greater IGE mass, suggesting that the lower IGE yields from C-O-Ne models is not a result of these models expanding differently than the C-O models. Rather, we interpret this disparity as indicating that the lower IGE yield in C-O-Ne models results from their lower  $^{12}\text{C}$  abundance and the fact that given similar fuel density, their  $^{20}\text{Ne}$ -rich fuel will burn to cooler temperatures than fuel in the C-O models. This in turn will result in slower burning to IGE and thus a lower IGE yield.

The estimated  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yields are shown in Figure 17 across the range of masses burned to IGE for all C-O and C-O-Ne realizations at 4.0 s simulation time, at which point the total mass burned to  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  had become constant, c.f. Figure 12. For comparable masses burned to IGE, the hybrid models tend to consistently produce slightly more  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  than the C-O models, although the ratio of IGE mass producing  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  given by the slope is the same in both cases, within the fit error. The reason for this trend is evident from Figure 18, which shows the fraction by mass of IGE material producing  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  evolving in time, and Figure 19, which shows the concurrent evolution of mass burned to IGE. During the deflagration phase, the C-O-Ne models on average burn more material to IGE and also had a significantly higher fraction of IGE material producing  $^{56}\text{Ni}$ , yielding more  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  than the C-O models. This may be due to greater neutronization in the early deflagration of the C-O models, which are ignited closer to the center and thus at slightly higher density than the initial deflagration of the C-O-Ne models. However, during the subsequent detonation phase, the C-O models on average burn more mass to IGE while maintaining a  $^{56}\text{Ni}$ /IGE fraction very similar to that of the C-O-Ne models, yielding significantly more  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  by

the end of the detonation phase. For reference, Table 1 summarizes the average values of  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield, IGE yield, and final kinetic energy for the 35 C-O and 35 C-O-Ne realizations with one standard deviation uncertainties.

**Table 1**  
Average Yields and Kinetic Energy

| Progenitor Type | $^{56}\text{Ni}$ ( $M_{\odot}$ ) | IGE ( $M_{\odot}$ ) | Kinetic Energy ( $\times 10^{51}$ ergs) |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| C-O             | $0.97 \pm 0.06$                  | $1.12 \pm 0.07$     | $1.39 \pm 0.05$                         |
| C-O-Ne          | $0.86 \pm 0.10$                  | $0.98 \pm 0.11$     | $1.06 \pm 0.10$                         |

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Our simulations of thermonuclear (Type Ia) supernovae from both hybrid C-O-Ne and reference C-O white dwarf progenitors using the deflagration to detonation transition paradigm have shown that on average the hybrid progenitors yield  $0.1 M_{\odot}$  less  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  than the C-O white dwarfs. While this indicates that Type Ia supernovae from C-O-Ne hybrids will be dimmer on average than those from C-O white dwarfs, we also find sufficient variance in burning efficiency with the geometry of the ignition region precipitating thermonuclear runaway such that there are some hybrid progenitors that yield more  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  than some C-O progenitors. Furthermore, we have found that not only do hybrid C-O-Ne progenitors deposit an average of 24% less kinetic energy in their ejecta than C-O progenitors but also this trend of more weakly expelled ejecta from hybrids is robust across all ignition geometries. The consistency of this result suggests it is a consequence of the lower energy release from Ne burning compared to C burning in spite of the fact that using  $^{20}\text{Ne}$  as an alternate fuel can still yield comparable  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  production in some cases.

As we noted above, we found considerable variation in the  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  production for both hybrid and traditional C-O models, and in particular, we found a much wider range of DDT times in the C-O models than the hybrid models. While in the realm of speculation, this result could follow from a greater degree of randomization in the geometry of the initially burned region for the C-O models than in the hybrids. The C-O models are initialized with an amplitude perturbation of the initially burned region comprised of several angular modes, whereas the thickness of the initially burned region in each of the hybrid models is controlled by a single angular mode.

We also found that for some ignition geometries in the hybrid progenitor, a combination of off-center ignition, flame buoyancy, and composition permits their cooler core region to delay burning until nearly 0.25 s after the detonation front has consumed the rest of the star. This result is unique to the hybrid progenitors that rely on the Urca process to provide a lower bound on the convective zone outside the core of the white dwarf. Delayed core burning in these white dwarfs may result in a modified  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  distribution in their ejecta compared to ejecta from C-O white dwarfs or even other hybrids with prompt core burning. Exploration of such effects is the subject of future work.

As our explosions from hybrid progenitors have a lower  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield and hence lower brightness than traditional

C-O models, the question of these events as the source of observed subluminal events, e.g. type Iax supernovae (Foley et al. 2013) arises. Our finding of an average  $^{56}\text{Ni}$  yield of  $0.1 M_{\odot}$  less than the C-O, (and the larger range of yields) indicates that explosions from these progenitors are not subluminal and cannot on their own explain subluminal events like type Iax supernovae.

A recent study by Kromer et al. (2015) addressed pure deflagrations in near-Chandrasekhar-mass hybrid WDs as the possible progenitor systems of these faint events. The study found that most of the mass stays bound and that early epoch light curves and spectra calculated from the explosion models are consistent with observations of SN 2008ha (Foley et al. 2009). We note that comparison between our results and these is difficult for reasons besides the obvious difference of the detonation phase in our simulations. The near-Chandrasekhar-mass progenitor model of Kromer et al. (2015) is substantially different in that it is parameterized and it does not include the effects of late-time convection, or the URCA process. Also, the ignition of the deflagration is substantially different. For these reasons, there is limited utility in a direct comparison between results.

This work was supported in part by the Department of Energy under grant DE-FG02-87ER40317. The software used in this work was in part developed by the DOE-supported ASC/Alliances Center for Astrophysical Thermonuclear Flashes at the University of Chicago. Results in this paper were obtained using the high-performance computing system at the Institute for Advanced Computational Science at Stony Brook University. The authors thank Sam Jones and Ivo Seitenzahl for fruitful discussions at the Fifty One Ergs conference, June 1-6, 2015.

## REFERENCES

- Almgren, A. S., Beckner, V. E., Bell, J. B., Day, M. S., Howell, L. H., Joggerst, C. C., Lijewski, M. J., Nonaka, A., Singer, M., & Zingale, M. 2010, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 715, 1221
- Arnett, W. D., Truran, J. W., & Woosley, S. E. 1971, *ApJ*, 165, 87
- Aspden, A. J., Bell, J. B., Day, M. S., Woosley, S. E., & Zingale, M. 2008, *ApJ*, 689, 1173
- Baraffe, I., Heger, A., & Woosley, S. E. 2004, *ApJ*, 615, 378
- Baron, E. 2014, *Nuclear Physics A*, 928, 319
- Belczynski, K., Bulik, T., & Ruiter, A. J. 2005, *ApJ*, 629, 915
- Bell, J. B., Day, M. S., Rendleman, C. A., Woosley, S. E., & Zingale, M. 2004, *ApJ*, 608, 883
- Bianco, F. B., Howell, D. A., Sullivan, M., Conley, A., Kasen, D., González-Gaitán, S., Guy, J., Astier, P., Balland, C., Carlberg, R. G., Fouchez, D., Fourmanoit, N., Hardin, D., Hook, I., Lidman, C., Pain, R., Palanque-Delabrouille, N., Perlmutter, S., Perrett, K. M., Pritchett, C. J., Regnault, N., Rich, J., & Rühlmann-Kleider, V. 2011, *ApJ*, 741, 20
- Blinnikov, S. I. & Khokhlov, A. M. 1986, *Soviet Astronomy Letters*, 12, 131
- Burkey, M. T., Reynolds, S. P., Borkowski, K. J., & Blondin, J. M. 2013, *ApJ*, 764, 63
- Bychkov, V. & Liberman, M. A. 1995, *A&A*, 302, 727
- Calder, A. C., Fryxell, B., Plewa, T., Rosner, R., Dursi, L. J., Weirs, V. G., Dupont, T., Robey, H. F., Kane, J. O., Remington, B. A., Drake, R. P., Dimonte, G., Zingale, M., Timmes, F. X., Olson, K., Ricker, P., MacNeice, P., & Tufo, H. M. 2002, *ApJS*, 143, 201
- Calder, A. C., Krueger, B. K., Jackson, A. P., & Townsley, D. M. 2013, *Frontiers of Physics*, 8, 168
- Calder, A. C., Townsley, D. M., Seitenzahl, I. R., Peng, F., Messer, O. E. B., Vladimirova, N., Brown, E. F., Truran, J. W., & Lamb, D. Q. 2007, *ApJ*, 656, 313

- Cao, Y., Kulkarni, S. R., Howell, D. A., Gal-Yam, A., Kasliwal, M. M., Valenti, S., Johansson, J., Amanullah, R., Goobar, A., Sollerman, J., Taddia, F., Horosh, A., Sagiv, I., Cenko, S. B., Nugent, P. E., Arcavi, I., Surace, J., Woźniak, P. R., Moody, D. I., Rebbapragada, U. D., Bue, B. D., & Gehrels, N. 2015, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Chamulak, D. A., Brown, E. F., Timmes, F. X., & Dupczak, K. 2008, *ApJ*, 677, 160
- Chen, M. C., Herwig, F., Denissenkov, P. A., & Paxton, B. 2014, *MNRAS*, 440, 1274
- Chiotellis, A., Schure, K. M., & Vink, J. 2012, *A&A*, 537, A139
- Cho, J., Lazarian, A., & Vishniac, E. T. 2003, in *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Berlin Springer Verlag, Vol. 614, Turbulence and Magnetic Fields in Astrophysics, ed. E. Falgarone & T. Passot, 56–98
- Ciaraldi-Schoolmann, F., Schmidt, W., Niemeyer, J. C., Röpke, F. K., & Hillebrandt, W. 2009, *ApJ*, 696, 1491
- Ciaraldi-Schoolmann, F., Seitenzahl, I. R., & Röpke, F. K. 2013, *A&A*, 559, A117
- Conley, A., Guy, J., Sullivan, M., Regnault, N., Astier, P., Balam, D., Basa, S., Carlberg, R. G., Fouchez, D., Hardin, D., Hook, I. M., Howell, D. A., Pain, R., Palanque-Delabrouille, N., Perrett, K. M., Pritchett, C. J., Rich, J., Ruhlmann-Kleider, V., Balam, D., Baumont, S., Ellis, R. S., Fabbro, S., Fakhouri, H. K., Fourmanoit, N., González-Gaitán, S., Graham, M. L., Hudson, M. J., Hsiao, E., Kronborg, T., Lidman, C., Mourao, A. M., Neill, J. D., Perlmutter, S., Riposte, P., Suzuki, N., & Walker, E. S. 2011, *ApJS*, 192, 1
- Denissenkov, P. A., Herwig, F., Bildsten, L., & Paxton, B. 2013a, *ApJ*, 762, 8
- Denissenkov, P. A., Herwig, F., Truran, J. W., & Paxton, B. 2013b, *ApJ*, 772, 37
- Denissenkov, P. A., Truran, J. W., Herwig, F., Jones, S., Paxton, B., Nomoto, K., Suzuki, T., & Toki, H. 2015, *MNRAS*, 447, 2696
- Denissenkov, P. A., Truran, J. W., Pignatari, M., Trappitsch, R., Ritter, C., Herwig, F., Battino, U., Setoodehnia, K., & Paxton, B. 2014, *MNRAS*, 442, 2058
- Di Stefano, R. 2010, *ApJ*, 719, 474
- Dilday, B., Howell, D. A., Cenko, S. B., Silverman, J. M., Nugent, P. E., Sullivan, M., Ben-Ami, S., Bildsten, L., Bolte, M., Endl, M., Filippenko, A. V., Gnat, O., Horesh, A., Hsiao, E., Kasliwal, M. M., Kirkman, D., Maguire, K., Marcy, G. W., Moore, K., Pan, Y., Parrent, J. T., Podsiadlowski, P., Quimby, R. M., Sternberg, A., Suzuki, N., Tytler, D. R., Xu, D., Bloom, J. S., Gal-Yam, A., Hook, I. M., Kulkarni, S. R., Law, N. M., Ofek, E. O., Polishook, D., & Poznanski, D. 2012, *Science*, 337, 942
- Farmer, R., Fields, C. E., & Timmes, F. X. 2015, *ApJ*, 807, 184
- Fickett, W. & Davis, W. C. 1979, *Detonation* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Foley, R. J., Challis, P. J., Chornock, R., Ganeshalingam, M., Li, W., Marion, G. H., Morrell, N. I., Pignata, G., Stritzinger, M. D., Silverman, J. M., Wang, X., Anderson, J. P., Filippenko, A. V., Freedman, W. L., Hamuy, M., Jha, S. W., Kirshner, R. P., McCully, C., Persson, S. E., Phillips, M. M., Reichart, D. E., & Soderberg, A. M. 2013, *ApJ*, 767, 57
- Foley, R. J., Chornock, R., Filippenko, A. V., Ganeshalingam, M., Kirshner, R. P., Li, W., Cenko, S. B., Challis, P. J., Friedman, A. S., Modjaz, M., Silverman, J. M., & Wood-Vasey, W. M. 2009, *AJ*, 138, 376
- Fryxell, B., Olson, K., Ricker, P., Timmes, F. X., Zingale, M., Lamb, D. Q., MacNeice, P., Rosner, R., Truran, J. W., & Tufo, H. 2000, *ApJS*, 131, 273
- Gamezo, V. N., Khokhlov, A. M., & Oran, E. S. 2005, *ApJ*, 623, 337
- García-Senz, D. & Bravo, E. 2005, *A&A*, 430, 585
- Geier, S., Marsh, T. R., Wang, B., Dunlap, B., Barlow, B. N., Schafferoth, V., Chen, X., Irrgang, A., Maxted, P. F. L., Ziegerer, E., Kupfer, T., Miszalski, B., Heber, U., Han, Z., Shporer, A., Telting, J. H., Gaensicke, B. T., Oestensen, R. H., O'Toole, S. J., & Napiwotzki, R. 2013, *A&A*, 554, A54
- Graham, M. L., Nugent, P. E., Sullivan, M., Filippenko, A. V., Cenko, S. B., Silverman, J. M., Clubb, K. I., & Zheng, W. 2015, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Graur, O., Bianco, F. B., & Modjaz, M. 2015, *MNRAS*, 450, 905
- Graur, O. & Maoz, D. 2013, *MNRAS*, 430, 1746
- Graur, O., Poznanski, D., Maoz, D., Yasuda, N., Totani, T., Fukugita, M., Filippenko, A. V., Foley, R. J., Silverman, J. M., Gal-Yam, A., Horesh, A., & Jannuzi, B. T. 2011, *MNRAS*, 417, 916
- Hachisu, I., Kato, M., & Nomoto, K. 2008, *ApJL*, 683, L127
- , 2010, *ApJL*, 724, L212
- Hansen, C. J., Kawaler, S. D., & Trimble, V. 2004, *Stellar interiors : physical principles, structure, and evolution* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 2004.)
- Herwig, F. 2005, *ARA&A*, 43, 435
- Hicks, E. P. 2015, *ApJ*, 803, 72
- Hicks, E. P. & Rosner, R. 2013, *ApJ*, 771, 135
- Hillebrandt, W., Kromer, M., Röpke, F. K., & Ruiter, A. J. 2013, *Frontiers of Physics*, 8, 116
- Hillebrandt, W. & Niemeyer, J. C. 2000, *ARA&A*, 38, 191
- Höflich, P., Wheeler, J. C., & Thielemann, F. K. 1998, *ApJ*, 495, 617
- Höflich, P. & Khokhlov, A. 1996, *ApJ*, 457, 500
- Höflich, P., Khokhlov, A. M., & Wheeler, J. C. 1995, *ApJ*, 444, 831
- Höflich, P., Khokhlov, A. M., & Wheeler, J. C. 1995, *ApJ*, 444, 831
- Howell, D. A. 2011, *Nature Communications*, 2, 350
- Howell, D. A., Sullivan, M., Brown, E. F., Conley, A., LeBorgne, D., Hsiao, E. Y., Astier, P., Balam, D., Balland, C., Basa, S., Carlberg, R. G., Fouchez, D., Guy, J., Hardin, D., Hook, I. M., Pain, R., Perrett, K., Pritchett, C. J., Regnault, N., Baumont, S., LeDu, J., Lidman, C., Perlmutter, S., Suzuki, N., Walker, E. S., & Wheeler, J. C. 2009, *ApJ*, 691, 661
- Howell, D. A., Sullivan, M., Nugent, P. E., Ellis, R. S., Conley, A. J., Le Borgne, D., Carlberg, R. G., Guy, J., Balam, D., Basa, S., Fouchez, D., Hook, I. M., Hsiao, E. Y., Neill, J. D., Pain, R., Perrett, K. M., & Pritchett, C. J. 2006, *Nature*, 443, 308
- Hoyle, F. & Fowler, W. A. 1960, *ApJ*, 132, 565
- Iben, Jr., I. & Tutukov, A. V. 1984, *ApJS*, 54, 335
- Insera, C., Sim, S. A., Wyrzykowski, L., Smartt, S. J., Fraser, M., Nicholl, M., Shen, K. J., Jerkstrand, A., Gal-Yam, A., Howell, D. A., Maguire, K., Mazzali, P., Valenti, S., Taubenberger, S., Benitez-Herrera, S., Bersier, D., Blagorodnova, N., Campbell, H., Chen, T.-W., Elias-Rosa, N., Hillebrandt, W., Kostrzewa-Rutkowska, Z., Kozłowski, S., Kromer, M., Lyman, J. D., Polshaw, J., Röpke, F. K., Ruiter, A. J., Smith, K., Spiro, S., Sullivan, M., Yaron, O., Young, D., & Yuan, F. 2015, *ApJL*, 799, L2
- Jackson, A. P., Calder, A. C., Townsley, D. M., Chamulak, D. A., Brown, E. F., & Timmes, F. X. 2010, *ApJ*, 720, 99
- Jackson, A. P., Townsley, D. M., & Calder, A. C. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 174
- Jordan, IV, G. C., Fisher, R. T., Townsley, D. M., Calder, A. C., Graziani, C., Asida, S., Lamb, D. Q., & Truran, J. W. 2008, *ApJ*, 681, 1448
- Kashi, A. & Soker, N. 2011, *MNRAS*, 417, 1466
- Khokhlov, A. 1993, *ApJL*, 419, L77
- Khokhlov, A. M. 1991, *A&A*, 245, 114
- , 1995, *ApJ*, 449, 695
- Khokhlov, A. M., Oran, E. S., & Wheeler, J. C. 1997, *ApJ*, 478, 678
- Kilic, M., Hermes, J. J., Gianninas, A., Brown, W. R., Heinke, C. O., Agüeros, M. A., Chote, P., Sullivan, D. J., Bell, K. J., & Harrold, S. T. 2014, *MNRAS*, 438, L26
- Kromer, M., Ohlmann, S. T., Pakmor, R., Ruiter, A. J., Hillebrandt, W., Marquardt, K. S., Röpke, F. K., Seitenzahl, I. R., Sim, S. A., & Taubenberger, S. 2015, *MNRAS*, 450, 3045
- Krueger, B. K., Jackson, A. P., Calder, A. C., Townsley, D. M., Brown, E. F., & Timmes, F. X. 2012, *ApJ*, 757, 175
- Krueger, B. K., Jackson, A. P., Townsley, D. M., Calder, A. C., Brown, E. F., & Timmes, F. X. 2010, *ApJL*, 719, L5
- Kuhlen, M., Woosley, S. E., & Glatzmaier, G. A. 2006, *ApJ*, 640, 407
- Leibundgut, B. 2001, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, 39, 67
- Mannucci, F., Della Valle, M., & Panagia, N. 2006, *MNRAS*, 370, 773
- Maoz, D. & Mannucci, F. 2012, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Aust.*, 29, 447
- Maoz, D., Mannucci, F., & Brandt, T. D. 2012, *MNRAS*, 426, 3282
- Maoz, D., Mannucci, F., & Nelemans, G. 2014, *Annual Reviews of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 52, 107
- Marquardt, K. S., Sim, S. A., Ruiter, A. J., Seitenzahl, I. R., Ohlmann, S. T., Kromer, M., Pakmor, R., & Röpke, F. K. 2015, *A&A*, 580, A118
- Mazzali, P. A., Sauer, D. N., Pastorello, A., Benetti, S., & Hillebrandt, W. 2008, *MNRAS*, 386, 1897
- Meakin, C. A., Seitenzahl, I., Townsley, D., Jordan, G. C., Truran, J., & Lamb, D. 2009, *ApJ*, 693, 1188
- Milne, P. A., Foley, R. J., Brown, P. J., & Narayan, G. 2015, *ApJ*, 803, 20
- Niemeyer, J. C. 1999, *ApJL*, 523, L57
- Niemeyer, J. C. & Hillebrandt, W. 1995, *ApJ*, 452, 769
- Niemeyer, J. C. & Woosley, S. E. 1997, *ApJ*, 475, 740
- Nomoto, K. 1980, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 27, 563
- Nomoto, K., Thielemann, F.-K., & Yokoi, K. 1984, *ApJ*, 286, 644
- Nonaka, A., Aspiden, A. J., Zingale, M., Almgren, A. S., Bell, J. B., & Woosley, S. E. 2012, *ApJ*, 745, 73
- Pakmor, R., Hachinger, S., Röpke, F. K., & Hillebrandt, W. 2011, *A&A*, 528, A117
- Pakmor, R., Kromer, M., Taubenberger, S., Sim, S. A., Röpke, F. K., & Hillebrandt, W. 2012, *ApJL*, 747, L10

- Paxton, B., Bildsten, L., Dotter, A., Herwig, F., Lesaffre, P., & Timmes, F. 2011, 192, 3
- Paxton, B., Cantiello, M., Arras, P., Bildsten, L., Brown, E. F., Dotter, A., Mankovich, C., Montgomery, M. H., Stello, D., Timmes, F. X., & Townsend, R. 2013, *ApJS*, 208, 4
- Paxton, B., Marchant, P., Schwab, J., Bauer, E. B., Bildsten, L., Cantiello, M., Dessart, L., Farmer, R., Hu, H., Langer, N., Townsend, R. H. D., Townsley, D. M., & Timmes, F. X. 2015, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Perlmutter, S., Aldering, G., Goldhaber, G., Knop, R. A., Nugent, P., Castro, P. G., Deustua, S., Fabbro, S., Goobar, A., Groom, D. E., Hook, I. M., Kim, A. G., Kim, M. Y., Lee, J. C., Nunes, N. J., Pain, R., Pennypacker, C. R., Quimby, R., Lidman, C., Ellis, R. S., Irwin, M., McMahon, R. G., Ruiz-Lapuente, P., Walton, N., Schaefer, B., Boyle, B. J., Filippenko, A. V., Matheson, T., Fruchter, A. S., Panagia, N., Newberg, H. J. M., Couch, W. J., & The Supernova Cosmology Project. 1999, *ApJ*, 517, 565
- Phillips, M. M. 1993, *ApJL*, 413, L105
- Plewa, T., Calder, A. C., & Lamb, D. Q. 2004, *ApJL*, 612, L37
- Poludnenko, A. Y. 2015, *Physics of Fluids*, 27, 014106
- Poludnenko, A. Y., Gardiner, T. A., & Oran, E. S. 2011, *Physical Review Letters*, 107, 054501
- Raskin, C., Timmes, F. X., Scannapieco, E., Diehl, S., & Fryer, C. 2009, *MNRAS*, 399, L156
- Riess, A. G., Filippenko, A. V., Challis, P., Clocchiatti, A., Diercks, A., Garnavich, P. M., Gilliland, R. L., Hogan, C. J., Jha, S., Kirshner, R. P., Leibundgut, B., Phillips, M. M., Reiss, D., Schmidt, B. P., Schommer, R. A., Smith, R. C., Spyromilio, J., Stubbs, C., Suntzeff, N. B., & Tonry, J. 1998, *AJ*, 116, 1009
- Röpke, F. K. 2007, *ApJ*, 668, 1103
- Röpke, F. K., Hillebrandt, W., & Niemeyer, J. C. 2004, *A&A*, 420, 411
- Röpke, F. K., Hillebrandt, W., Schmidt, W., Niemeyer, J. C., Blinnikov, S. I., & Mazzali, P. A. 2007, *ApJ*, 668, 1132
- Röpke, F. K., Niemeyer, J. C., & Hillebrandt, W. 2003, *ApJ*, 588, 952
- Ruiter, A. J., Belczynski, K., Sim, S. A., Hillebrandt, W., Fryer, C. L., Fink, M., & Kromer, M. 2011, *MNRAS*, 417, 408
- Scalzo, R. A., Aldering, G., Antilogus, P., Aragon, C., Bailey, S., Baltay, C., Bongard, S., Buton, C., Childress, M., Chotard, N., Copin, Y., Fakhouri, H. K., Gal-Yam, A., Gangler, E., Hoyer, S., Kasliwal, M., Loken, S., Nugent, P., Pain, R., Pécontal, E., Pereira, R., Perlmutter, S., Rabinowitz, D., Rau, A., Rigaudier, G., Runge, K., Smadja, G., Tao, C., Thomas, R. C., Weaver, B., & Wu, C. 2010, *ApJ*, 713, 1073
- Schmidt, W., Niemeyer, J. C., & Hillebrandt, W. 2006a, *A&A*, 450, 265
- Schmidt, W., Niemeyer, J. C., Hillebrandt, W., & Röpke, F. K. 2006b, *A&A*, 450, 283
- Seitenzahl, I. R., Townsley, D. M., Peng, F., & Truran, J. W. 2009, *Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables*, 95, 96
- Shen, K. J., Bildsten, L., Kasen, D., & Quataert, E. 2012, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 748, 35
- Silverman, J. M., Nugent, P. E., Gal-Yam, A., Sullivan, M., Howell, D. A., Filippenko, A. V., Arcavi, I., Ben-Ami, S., Bloom, J. S., Cenko, S. B., Cao, Y., Chornock, R., Clubb, K. I., Coil, A. L., Foley, R. J., Graham, M. L., Griffith, C. V., Horesh, A., Kasliwal, M. M., Kulkarni, S. R., Leonard, D. C., Li, W., Matheson, T., Miller, A. A., Modjaz, M., Ofek, E. O., Pan, Y.-C., Perley, D. A., Poznanski, D., Quimby, R. M., Steele, T. N., Sternberg, A., Xu, D., & Yaron, O. 2013, *ApJS*, 207, 3
- Sim, S. A., Röpke, F. K., Hillebrandt, W., Kromer, M., Pakmor, R., Fink, M., Ruiter, A. J., & Seitenzahl, I. R. 2010, *ApJL*, 714, L52
- Timmes, F. X. 1999, *ApJS*, 124, 241
- . 2015, Torch Code, <http://cococubed.asu.edu/>, freely available
- Timmes, F. X. & Woosley, S. E. 1992, *ApJ*, 396, 649
- Townsley, D. M., Calder, A. C., Asida, S. M., Seitenzahl, I. R., Peng, F., Vladimirova, N., Lamb, D. Q., & Truran, J. W. 2007, *ApJ*, 668, 1118
- Townsley, D. M., Jackson, A. P., Calder, A. C., Chamulak, D. A., Brown, E. F., & Timmes, F. X. 2009, *ApJ*, 701, 1582
- Townsley, D. M., Timmes, F. X., Jackson, A. P., Miles, B. J., Calder, A. C., & Brown, E. F. 2015, *ApJ*, to be submitted
- Truran, J. W. & Cameron, A. G. W. 1971, *Ap&SS*, 14, 179
- Wang, B., Justham, S., & Han, Z. 2013, *A&A*, 559, A94
- Webbink, R. F. 1984, *ApJ*, 277, 355
- Werner, K. & Herwig, F. 2006, *PASP*, 118, 183
- Whelan, J. & Iben, Jr., I. 1973, *ApJ*, 186, 1007
- Williams, B. J., Blair, W. P., Blondin, J. M., Borkowski, K. J., Ghavamian, P., Long, K. S., Raymond, J. C., Reynolds, S. P., Rho, J., & Winkler, P. F. 2011, *ApJ*, 741, 96
- Woosley, S. E. 1990, in *Supernovae*, ed. A. G. Petschek, 182–212
- Woosley, S. E., Kerstein, A. R., Sankaran, V., Aspden, A. J., & Röpke, F. K. 2009, *ApJ*, 704, 255
- Woosley, S. E. & Weaver, T. A. 1995, *ApJS*, 101, 181
- Woosley, S. E., Weaver, T. A., & Taam, R. E. 1980, in *Texas Workshop on Type I Supernovae*, ed. J. C. Wheeler, 96–112
- Woosley, S. E., Wunsch, S., & Kuhlen, M. 2004, *ApJ*, 607, 921
- Wunsch, S. & Woosley, S. E. 2004, *ApJ*, 616, 1102
- Yamaguchi, H., Badenes, C., Foster, A. R., Bravo, E., Williams, B. J., Maeda, K., Nobukawa, M., Eriksen, K. A., Brickhouse, N. S., Petre, R., & Koyama, K. 2015, *ApJL*, 801, L31
- Yuan, F., Quimby, R. M., Wheeler, J. C., Vinkó, J., Chatzopoulos, E., Akerlof, C. W., Kulkarni, S., Miller, J. M., McKay, T. A., & Aharonian, F. 2010, *ApJ*, 715, 1338
- Zingale, M. & Dursi, L. J. 2007, *ApJ*, 656, 333
- Zingale, M., Woosley, S. E., Rendleman, C. A., Day, M. S., & Bell, J. B. 2005, *ApJ*, 632, 1021
- Zorotovic, M., Schreiber, M. R., & Gänsicke, B. T. 2011, *A&A*, 536, A42